ON THE TAXONOMIC METHOD IN PALAEOANTHROPOLOGY (HISTORICAL ANTHROPOLOGY)

By

P. LIPTÁK

Institute for Anthropology of the József Attila University Szeged

(Received Apr 10, 1965)

Introduction

It is very incomprehensible why taxonomic studies have recently become so rare among anthropologists. At the same time the „new systematics" becomes more and more dominant in zoology beginning already from the year 1940.

L. OSCHINSKY's remark in his review on C. S. COON's work may be regarded quite reasonable (1). „... in physical anthropology ... evolutionary studies of the subspecies had been much neglected and taxonomic theory largely ignored" (2) (Quoted with omissions). Really, reviewing e. g. the physical anthropological studies of the last decade we get a very peculiar and rather onesided picture of this field of science. Undoubtedly every epoch has its actual problems but the author of the present paper is strongly convinced that researches of „classical problems" remain always actual, moreover they are becoming „up-to-date" making use of recent research results on a wide basis, taking into considerations several relations and being very pretentious. The author endeavoured to develop his „taxonomic method" of palaeoanthropological researches which has already been successfully applied in Czechoslovakia (3).

In „Current Anthropology" — obviously as a sign of the actuality and importance of the theme — a discussion was begun recently (1952—1953) on taxonomic questions. For sake of objectivity it must be noted that the case when two researchers *of the same country*, as now BIELICKI and WIERCZINSKI (4 and 5) are the authors of the first discussion papers is not very fortunate the more since willy-nilly the pecularities of the scientific life of their home determine their theme. A common feature of the above mentioned anthropologists as well as of many scientists working more or less on the same theme is that they look for new viewpoints and ideas among the researchers of countries having great scientific results or of their own homeland. In my opinion it is hardly compatible with the endeavour to objective truth so indispensable in science. Perhaps it is noteworthy that when the author of this article has been dealing with anthropotaxonomic problems he is making the possible widest use of available literature.

In view of the reasons mentioned above below I enlist my works containing new anthropotaxonomic considerations. It is likely that anthropologists having special interest in this subject think this much more reasonable than unusual, especially since these works had been published in rather a scattered way and in journals not widely known in other countries. As it appears, usual bibliographic data here are followed by a short autoreference and especially in case of earlier works, references of reviews published in different journals.

1. L'analyse typologique de la population de Kérpuszta au Moyen Age. — Acta Arch. Hung. *3*, 303–370 (1953).

The work deals with metric and morphological (craniosystematic) characters of the more important Europoid races within the frames of a taxonomic analysis of the so far known greatest series from the Arpadian age (mostly from the 11th century).

The work was subjected to a detailed reviewing by H. V. VALLOIS in L'Anthropologie *59*, 329–330 (1955).

2. An Anthropological Survey of Magyar Prehistory. — Acta Linguistica Hung. *4*, 133–170 (1954).

It deals first of all with the place and characteristics of the Uralian (or synonymously Ugrian, Uralo-Altaic) race. It is an attempt for the synthesis of the ethnogenesis of the Hungarian people.

The work was reviewed on the one hand by H. V. VALLOIS in L'Anthropologie *60*, 122–123 (1958) and besides this a Polish reference was published in Przeglad Antropologiczny *XXIV* (1958).

3. Zur Frage der anthropologischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Mittleren Donaubecken und Mittelasien. — Acta Orient. Hung. *5*, 217–312 (1955).

This work was reviewed in three periodicals:

a) H. J. FLEURE: Man, 1957, Ref. No. 232.
b) H. V. VALLOIS: L'Anthropologie *61*, 552–553 (1957).
c) K. GERHARDT: Homo *8*, 192 (1957).

This work deserves a somewhat longer autoreference.

The main theme is expressed by the title itself and also it contains a detailed craniosystematic characterization of Turanian (in Soviet anthropological literature: South Siberian) and Pamirian races. Here I had to emphasize that although the concept of „Turanian race" of earlier authors (as DENIKER, HADDON, MONTANDON, EICKSTEDT and the Soviet anthropologists) agrees with the system followed by me, too, SCHWIDETZKY's paper (6) — by an erroneous interpretation — calls Turanids Pamiriens and denies the existence of an independent Turanid race and identifies it with Central Asiatic Mongoloid race, respectively. My critical remarks were found consistent by K. GERHARDT in his review referred to above. The fact that SCHWIDETZKY in her recent paper (7) calls Pamirians Turanids with a rare persistency (sensu SCHWIDETZKY) is beyond my reason. Namely, if the scientific value of my paper would undergo any doubt, perhaps it would be very useful for both of us and first of all for science, to express her views in a discussion paper or in any kind of answer. A researcher so well oriented in many disciplines of antropology and enjoying so wide a recognition easily may confess such an obvious mistake done in the field of anthroposystematics and may not be anxious about his prestige.

4. Awaren und Magyaren in Donau-Theiss Zwischenstromgebiet. — Acta Arch. Hung. *8*, 199–268 (1958).

It is the palaeoanthropological study of a wide region of the Great Hungarian Plain (Alföld). In respect to Europoids it tries to set up an independent craniosystematics and it broadens our knowledge of the ethnogenesis of „Avars" and Magyars with new data and interdependences. Reviewed by H. V. VALLOIS in L'Anthropologie *63*, 130–132 (1959).

5. The „Avar Period" Mongoloids in Hungary. — Acta Arch. Hung. *10*, 91—94 (1959).

a) H. J. FLEURE: Man, 1960, Ref. No. 174.
b) H. V. VALLOIS: L'Anthropologie, *64*, 353—354 (1960).

This work changes the anthropotaxonomy of the previous work for Mongoloids and Europo-Mongoloids with a better one, partly relying upon new material. In my opinion it gives an unambiguous differential-diagnosis, unlimited in space and time, of the Europoid and Mongoloid great races. Later I shall return to this work.

Below I give a list of my papers more of theoretical and methodical character, dealing with the importance of anthropotaxonomy or some questions of it — owing to their recent date of publication they have not yet been reviewed in any journal.

6. Die Bedeutung der taxonomischen Fragen in der historischen Anthropologie. — Acta F. R. N. Univ. Comen. *5*, 309—314 (1961). (A lecture held on the Conference of Czechoslovakian anthropologists in 1959).

It contains the outlines of a systematics of Europoids and Mongoloids built by the author.

7. On the Problems of Historical Anthropology (Palaeoanthropology). — Acta Univ. Szegediensis, Acta Biologica *7*, 175—183 (1961).

The topics of the paper is the division of anthropology and the place held by among sciences as well as some problems of anthropotaxonomy and etnogenesis.

8. Über die Bedeutung taxonomischer Forschungen in der Anthropologie. — Actes du VI[e] Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques, Paris, 1 (1960), pp. 211—213. (Published in 1962).

It points out the polymorphous and polytypical character of the species *Homo sapiens* and emphasizes the importance of taxonomic analysis within the series.

9. *Homo sapiens* — species collectiva. Anthropologiai Közlemények, *6*, 17—27 (1962).

This is the first short account on the theoretical basis and classification of an essentially new anthroposystematics, of Europoids and Mongoloids (in Hungarian, with a short English summary). A more detailed anthroposystematics with preference to the points of view of differential-diagnostics have already appeared earlier in my series of university lectures under the title „Embertan és emberszármazástan" („Anthropology and Human Evolution".)

10. Einige Fragen der Antropotaxonomie. — Anthropos *15*, 149—154 (1963). (Akten des Anthropologischen Kongresses, MIKULOV, 1961.)

I mention that a part of my work done in taxonomy has been critically evaluated by K. GERHARDT (8).

Concerning researches done in the field of systematics Hennig's words seem to be very justified when he speaks of a „contesting struggle" of the different fields of biology (9). In his opinion this comes from the fact that none of the natural sciences has so much different problems and methods of solution. This causes a specialisation of the specialists themselves and the relative strong iso-

lation of the single sciences is a consequence of this. Let stand here a quotation from his thoughts word by word:

„Wenn die biologische Systematik in diesem Konkurrenzkamp in neuer Zeit gegenüber anderen und, wie man vielfach hören kann, *jüngeren oder modernen Teilgebieten* (stress by P. L.) etwas an Boden verloren hat, so liegt das weniger an der geringeren praktischen oder theoretisch-wissenschaftlichen Bedeutung der Systematik als vielmehr daran, dass diese es nicht recht verstanden hat, ihre Bedeutung im Rahmen der biologischen Gesamtwissenschaft in das gebührende Licht zu setzen und ein festgefügtes Lehrgebäude ihrer Probleme, Aufgaben und Methoden zu errichten." We completely agree with him upon this and similarly as the zoosystematics, anthroposystematics has to fight for its „place under the sun".

We have to call attention upon a work of OSCHNSKY's referred to rather rarely (10), in which he points out not only the importance of anthropotaxonomy but he also denies the widely recognized but wholly erroneous statements of some genetics. Here we think of the blood-group systems showing monogenic heredity. Fortunately it has been pointed out by VOGEL and his coauthors (11) and later by MOURANT, too (12) that the frequency of genes determining the ABO system is decisively determined by epidermics, therefore they are much less applicable to clear up historical processes (ethnogenesis etc.) than the classic methods.

In an earlier paper of mine I have enlisted the works written in the field of zoosystematics containing the more important statements of general validity. (A detailed literature is to be found in my studies published in the years 1961 and 1962.) Furthermore a recent work by SIMPSON (13) deserves much attention, too. Critically reviewing his own earlier conception he distinguishes systematics and taxonomy. „Taxonomy is the theoretical study of classification, including its bases, principles, procedures and rules" (14). His conception can be applied to anthropology, too, and accordingly anthropotaxonomy has to deal with the theoretical and methodical problems of classification. However, systematics is somewhat more than this: „Systematics is the scientific study of the kinds and diversity of organisms and of any and *all relationships* (stress by the author) among them" (15). Thus systematics is a synthetic science: it can be applied for man including the detailed study of living and fossil Hominids as well as the study of *any time-and-space-relations* existing between them.

Anthropotaxonomy

Homo sapiens is a polytypic species divided into several subspecies (geographical races). The classification of human forms is markedly complicated since horizontal and vertical aspects are to be taken into consideration; the racial systematics reflecting reality is based upon evolution. The skeletal remains of prae- and protohistoric populations give a connecting link to fossil forms. The consideration of palaeoanthropologic data largely helps to a better foundation of the classification. That is why I endeavoured in Table 1. and 2. to emphasize differences in craniosystematics; in the anthropological literature data are scattered, hardly can be found if any.

The systematization of living population gives rise to a lot of problems. Unlike animal population most of human population is not only polymorphic but also polytypic. The cause of this is that the great migrations render possible the rearrangement of human society (communities); the linkage of characteristics of human races originating from the most different regions ceases only step by step even in spite of the prolonged mixovariation. This gives the possibility to compare human populations not only simply relying upon their parameters but simultaneously to carry out intraserial taxonomic analysis, too. However, a condition for this is the systematics relying upon palaeoanthropologic data. In the tables below I wished to give such a survey. There exist four great races differing from each other phyletically, too.

A) *Veddo-Australoids* represent an earlier stage in the phylogeny of *Homo sapiens*. There are many instances in paleontology for „constant forms" or „conservative forms" showing a slower evolution. There appears some microevolutional retardation at this great race. As a whole they are characterized by dark colour complexion, more or less expressed dolichocephaly and in general by the complex of archemorphic traits.

B) Representatives of the *Europoid* (and Europoid-like) great race earlier were dealt with under the name „whites" (or Caucasoid race) but it is more correct to call them Europoids. The white skin-colour is not a general characteristics, there are more darkely pigmented races among them, too. Earlier (e. g. in the Mesolithic) the Europoid race was more widely spread than at the beginning of our era. From the time of discoveries the expansion of the Europoid populations have taken a new impetus. The continents oversea (both the Americas and Australia) have been more intensively populated from Europe with a continuous decrease of the aborigines. Europoids likely take their origin from Veddo Australoids. Generally they are characterized by a *relatively* lighter colour complexion, straight or slightly wave hair and pronounced hairiness of the face and body. Five groups are distinguished of wich the first four are Europoids beyond any doubt but the fifth is taken only conditionally as a mixomorphus group. (Table 1).

C) *Mongoloid* (and Mongoloid-like) great race. The general characteristics are: light or darker brown skin, rigid, in cross-section circular hair, as a rule dark eyes and hair and mostly they are low in growth. The differential diagnostic characteristics of the face are extremely important, expressed in a flat face, the nose is less protruding, the epicanthus covers the inner part of the eye and partly the eyelids, too; the face is slightly profiled horizontally, the mucous lips are wider as compared with the mean Europoids, minimal or none hair on the face and body. As for the differential diagnosis of the skeletal remains of Europoido-Mongoloid races I refer to my work published in 1959 (16), Their formation supposedly took place in the northern parts of Asia (Table 2).

D) The original residence of representatives of the *Negroid* (and Negroid-like) race was the tropics and they cempletely acclimatized to it. First of all a dark skin means a great advantage here, since the considerable pigment layer in the skin decreases the undesired effect of the Sun. Further Negriods are characterized by curly hair no or rare hair on the body and face, a bulging forehead, a tendency to long-headness, prognathy of the face, wide nose and very broad mucous lips.

E) *Amerindian* (or Americanoid) mixomorphous complex. There had been a rather long debate among anthropologists about the taxonomic place of the Indian aborigines of the two American continents. According to an earlier opinion they belong to the Mongoloids. Nowadays most of the scientists agree upon the fact that Amerindians starting from North and East-Asia, respectively, at the end of the glacial period and at the beginning of the holocene came to the double American continents in several waves through the drylandbridge existing where today we find the Bering-strait. Accordingly races like the American Indians were formed first of all by means of hybridization and a decisive role in this can be ascribed to the Veddo-Australoid and Mongoloid races, while the part of Europoids in the anthropologic formation of the Amerindians is rather moderate. The representatives of this race are characterized among others by the horizontal and vertical profilation of the face mostly being the same as in the case Europoids. The skin-colour being of different shades of brown is never so dark as e. g. at most of Veddo-Australoids. After all it seems justified that American Indians cannot be included to any great race, therefore in our system they held the place of a neutral taxonomic category of the Amerindian complex (Table 3).

Concerning nomenclature microsubspecies (race) within the great races are generally expressed by the ending-oid, following the usage of the English, while in German and Hungarian-id is used mostly. For sake of an easy orientation beside these there are groups also to be distinguished.

Within the subspecies *Homo sapiens* more taxonomic categories were applied than in zoology. This is necessary in order to make feel the relations (or at least similarities) between human forms existing at the present time — and the last two thousand years. It also must be considered as a result of latest researches that the concept subspecies of *Homo sapiens* takes place somewhere between great race and race. Namely the four great races are very few but at the same least similarities) between human forms existing at the present time — and the time the 48 races are too much. Forms, the fossil (and/or subfossil) corresponding of which has already been known and the existence of which is beyond doubt bear over further criticism. It may be that a part of races can be regarded as members of a „cline" (geografically isolated in part) as understood by HUXLEY. An example of this kind is the Dinaric — Armenoid — Pamirian line placed in a single geographical zone of Eurasian mountain-range. To this belongs the oldest, called in GERHARDTS interpretation Tauride (Glockenbecher-) race the gracilisation of which, in different directions and to different extent, supposedly leads to the above mentioned formations.

The word *type* is deeply rooted in the nomenclature of hominid systematics but it seems reasonable to avoid it in the future. Perhaps it could be used as a neutral concept without any taxonomic value but it might be emphasized that there is *nothing common* in it to the idealistic „Platonic" archaetype. The unscrupulous usage of the word „typology" would be an even greater error in view of the above considerations. The concept of „typology" (deprived of all its idealistic content) can be applied for non-spatial categories (as e. g. constitutional-typology). The name „polytipical" does not seem reasonable to be avoided due to its wide usage. Of course it could also be substituted with the synonimous concept „circle of races" suggested by RENSCH, or with the less widely spread but in our opinion very suggestive designation „collective species".

In my study I took into consideration the works of the following authors: RIPLEY (1899), DENIKER (1900), GIUFFRIDA-RUGGERI (1913), MONTANDON (1933) V. EICKSTEDT (1934), COON (1939), JARCHO-ROGINSKII (1941), HOOTON (1946), DEBEC (1948), COON-GARN-BIRDSELL (1950), the collection „Proishoždenia čeloveka" (1951) and the discussion papers of BUNAK and DEBEC published in 1946 and 1958, resp., in form of two-two studies in „Sovietskaia Etnografia" (17).

In the characterization of Europoid and Mongoloid races to be found in the enclosed table, I tried to apply the principle of taxonomic relevance of the characteristics. I am of the opinion that such sayings that e.g. one form differs from the other in six and from the third in nine characteristics, are empty if the taxonomic value of the characteristics is not considered. The work of systematization requires constant estimation what cannot be done only on a quantitative basis; the „total morphological pattern" emphasized by LE GROS CLARK is extremely important (18). This latter does not change rapidly during microevolution therefore it can be applied to solve the problems of either evolutional systematics or of ethnogenesis much more than a very careful (supported even by statistical data) comparison of some arbitrarily chosen quantitative characteristics. Here we call the attention to JARCHO's hardly known pioneering work on the different taxonomical relevance of the characteristics (19). This basic, classical problem is actual even today therefore it has remained modern: it is highly appreciated even by LE GROS CLARK (20). It is also noteworthy what a great importance he attributes to taxonomical problems.

Reading WASHBURN's work published in 1962 makes one feel quite the opposite. This paper contains the following rather surprising statement: „It is significant that as I was reviewing classifications in preparing this lecture, I found that almost none of them mentioned any purpose for which people were being classified (21). I think that WASHBURN was very unfortunate in chosing the corresponding literature, when he made the above conclusion. Perhaps all the books and studies published in Europe were beyond his scope such as e. g. LE GROS CLARK's book in English referred to above. The classification of Man has the same aim as the classification of animals and plants but perhaps we can disregard to quote here the referring literature amounting to a whole library. Naturally at living humanity subspecies and microsubspecies are really important — see HUXLEY (22) but in the vertical classification of Hominids one has to take sides in respect to the systematics of species and even of genus. Mention must perhaps made here — in reference to SIMPSON, too — that systematics is one of the possible methods of a scientific synthesis of the living world.

The heredity of characteristics serving as a basis for classification is unfortunately scarcely known: it is due on the one hand to pleiotropy (most of the genes determine several characteristics of the organism) and to the existence of polygenes on the other, the latter means that a certain character is brought about by several gene-pairs, each of which influences a character (as e.g. colour of the skin) to a less extent only. It is very curious that characteristics, the process of heredity of which is well known, generally are not or hardly applicable to characterize human species. The list compiled by DOBZHANSKY (23) takes into consideration three categories, namely characteristics at which

a) the way of heredity is known;
b) the way of heredity is relatively known, and
c) the way of heredity is hardly known.

Taking this order as a basis and comparing it with characteristics important for differential diagnostics, given in any important taxonomical work, and also in the present paper (see the Tables 1 and 2) it appears that there is a reverse correlation between the two. This does not mean that the genetic basis of differences between the races is uncertain, but more — as mentioned above — that the heredity of normal human characteristics is not known even today.

Summary

Considering the above mentioned facts as well as the main results of the works referred to, the following statements can be done.

Homo sapiens is a polytypic species consequently the study of its subspecies (anthropotaxonomy) is an important part of human biology (anthropology „sensu stricto").

Human population is characterized not only by polymorphism: intraserial taxonomical analysis cannot be neglected especially in case of palaeoanthropologic (prehistoric and/or protohistoric) matter, where several relations of the individuals or groups to be investigated are unknown. This supposes a *natural system* near to reality extended also to the skeletal remains of human subspecies and microsubspecies. Before such a system would have been built up, studies of this kind were regarded as not being „up-to-date". This unfortunately resulted in hindering several young, promising researchers to deal with studies of this kind.

We think it necessary to emphasize that important new results are brought about by taxonomical analysis in the field of palaeoanthropology (study of ethnogenesis, the distribution of human variations in time and space). The era from upper Paleolith to the historical Middle Age in the social and biological history of mankind is a time relatively scarcely known thus taxonomic studies of this period are an extremely important part of anthropologic investigations.

In the present work the author outlined a new anthroposystematics in the frame of which he gave a short characterization of Europoid and Mongoloid forms.

References

1. Coon, C. S., 1962: The Origin of Races. New York.
2. Oschinsky, L., 1963: A Critique of „The Origin of Races" by C. S. Coon. Anthropologica, N. S. Vol. V. No. 1. pp. 111—116.
3. Malá, H., 1962: Experience with the Application of Lipták's Typologic Method on the Osteologic Material from Southern Slovakia. Acta F. R. N. Univ. Comen. VII. 3—5., Anthropologia, pp. 259—266.
4. Bielicki, T., 1962: Some Possibilities for Estimating Interpopulation Relationship on the Basis of Continuous Traits. Current Anthropology, 3, No. 1, pp. 3—8.
5. Wiercinski, A., 1962: The Racial Analysis of Human Population in Relation to Their Ethnogenesis. Current Anthropology, 3, No. 1, pp. 2. and 9—20.
6. Schwidetzky, I., 1950: Turaniden-Studien: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der mathematischnaturwissenschaftlichen Klasse Nr. 9. Wiesbaden.

7. Schwidetzky, I., 1963: Europide und Mongolide in Russisch-Asien seit dem Jungpaläolitikum. Homo, 14, p. 165.
8. Gerhardt, K., 1957: Bemerkungen zum Kraniotypen-Bestand. Homo, 8, pp. 43—48.
9. Hennig, W., 1950: Grundzüge einer Theorie der phylogenetischen Systematik. Berlin.
10. Oschinsky, L., 1959: A Reappraisal of Recent Serological, Genetic and Morphological Research on the Taxonomy of the Races of Africa and Asia. Anthropologica N. S. 1. pp. 1—25.
11. Vogel, F.—Pettenkofer, H. J.—Helmbold, W., 1960: Über die Populationsgenetik der ABO-Blutgruppen.
Acta Genet. Statist. Med., 10, pp. 267—294.
Vogel, F., 1961: Lehrbuch der allgemeinen Humangenetik. Berlin—Göttingen—Heidelberg.
12. Mourant, A. E., 1961: Evolution, Genetics and Anthropology. The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. 91, pp. 151—165.
13. Simpson, G. G.: Principles of Animal Taxonomy. New York.
14. Simpson op. cit. p. 11.
15. Simpson op. cit. p. 7.
16. Lipták P., 1959: The „Avar Period" Mongoloids in Hungary. Acta Arch. Hung., 10, pp. 269—272.
17. In chronological order they are as follows: Ripley, W. Z., 1899: The Races of Europe. New York.
Deniker, J., 1900: Les races et les peuples de la terre. Paris.
Giuffrida—Ruggeri, V., 1913: Homo sapiens. Wien—Leipzig.
Montandon, G., 1933: La race, les races. Paris.
v. Eickstedt, E., 1934: Rassenkunde und Rassengeschichte der Menschheit. Stuttgart.
Coon, C. S., 1939: The Races of Europe. New York.
Bunak, V. V.—Nesturh, M. F.—Roginskii, Ia. Ia., 1941: Antropologija. Moskva.
Hooton, E. A., 1946: Up from the Ape. 2nd ed. New York.
Debec, G. F., 1948: Paleoantropologija SSSR. Moskva.
Coon, C. S.—Garn, S. M.—Birdsell, J. B., 1950: Races. Springfield.
— —, 1951: Proishoždenie čeloveka i drevnee raselenije čelovečestva.
Trudy Instituta Etnografii, XVI.
Bunak, V. V., 1956: Čelovečeskie rasy i puti ih obrazovanija. Sovetskaia Etnografia (=SE), I, pp. 86—105.
Debec, G. F., 1956: O principah klassifikacii čelovečeskih ras. SE, IV. pp. 129—142.
Bunak, V. V., 1958: Ob očerednyh zadačah v izučenii rasoobrazovanija u čeloveka. SE, III. pp. 125—135.
Debec, G. F., 1958: Opyt grafičeskogo izobrazenija genealogičeskoj klassifikacii čelovečeskih ras. SE, IV. pp. 74—94.
18. Le Gros Clark, W. E., 1955: The Fossil Evidence for Human Evolution. Chicago.
19. Jarho, A. I., 1934: Metodika antropologičeskih issledovanii. O nekatoryh voprosah rassovogo analiza. Antropologičeskij Žurnal, III. pp. 43—71.
20. Le Gros Clark, op. cit. pp. 25—28.
21. Washburn, S. L., 1963: The Study of Race. American Anthropologist, 65. pp. 521—531.
22. Huxley, J., 1942: Evolution. The Modern Synthesis. New York, pp. 406—408.
23. Dobzhansky, Th., 1950: Human Diversity and Adaptation. Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology, XV. pp. 385—400.

Table 1 — Europoid great race

Group	Race (mikrosubspecies)	Subrace, or subgroup — Fossil forms Characteristics
A) Cromagnoids	1. Cromagnoid-A (Dalic)	Tall medium — tall stature (168—172 cm) protruding, erect or convex nose dolicho-mesocranic (cranial index: 74—77) low, broad and angular face rectangular orbits
	2. Cromagnoid-B (East-Europid)	Medium stature (164—166 cm) moderately protruding concave nose meso-brachycranic (cranial index: 78—82) face and orbits like preceding
	3. Other Cromagnoids	a) Andronovo b) Borreby
B) Nordoids	4. Protonordic 5. Nordic (Reihengräber-Typus)	Brno-Predmosti race Tall medium — tall stature (168—174 cm) rugged cranium great dimensions of the head (cranial length: 188-×) face and upper face narrow dolichocranic (cranial index: 71—74)
C) Mediterraneans	6. Protomediterranean 7. West Mediterranean (Atlanto-mediterranean)	Combe-Capelle race Tall medium — tall stature (167—171 cm) moderately rugged cranium cranial vault relatively low, very long (190-×) face very narrow tendency to hyperdolichocrany (cranial index: 68—72)

	8. Middle Mediterranean	a) Pontic b) „Classic" (gracile) Mediterranean Short or short medium stature (160—164 cm) small faced, small jawed small dimensions of the vault (cranial length: 182—187) dolichocranic (cranial index: 72—75) c) North African Mediterranean
	9 East Mediterranean (Orientalo-indid)	a) „Oriental race" b) „Iranian Plateau" (Khorassan) type c) Transcaspian (?) d) Indid
D) Brachycephals with dark complexion of colours	10. Lappid (Protoalpine)	Very broad and low face very low mandible osseous nose broad (chamaerrhin) short stature (156—158 cm)
	11. Alpine	Moderately broad face narrow or moderately broad nose stature short medium (160—164 cm) paedomorphism
	12. Dinaric	Strongly protruding convex nose occiput flat (planoccipital) tall medium or tall stature (168—174 cm) face narrow or moderately broad
	13. Armenoid	Nose very strongly protruding, convex sloping forehead with pronounced glabella occiput flat (planoccipital) medium stature (164—166 cm)

	14. Pamirian	Nose moderately protruding, the profile straight or convex forehead high glabella slightly pronounced lambdoid flattening or curved occiput tall medium stature (165—167 cm)
E) Undeterminable (mixomorphous)	15. Polynesian	a) New Zealand (maori) type b) Mikronesian c) Hawaiian

Table 2 — Mongoloid (and Mongoloid-like) great race

Group	Race (mikrosubspecies)	Subrace, other subgroup. — Fossil forms Characteristics
A) Mongoloid	1. Bajkal (Protomongoloid)	Dolichocranic low cranial vault, sloping forehead lambdoid flattening broad and very high face short stature (158—162 cm)
	2. Sinid (North Chinese)	Diagnostic features (in relation to Baikal type): cranial vault higher cranial index higher (mesocranic) stature tall medium (167—169 cm)
	3. Low-faced Mongoloid (Saianic, Tungid)	Diagnostic features: moderately brachycranic broad but relatively low face cranial vault low.

	4. Central-Asiatic Mongoloid	Diagnostic features: brachycranic very high and narrow face (hyperleptoprosopy frequent) stature higher than the „Baikal type"
	5. South Mongoloid	a) Birman type b) Palaungid c) Sanid d) Protomalayid e) Deuteromalayid
B) Europoido-Mongoloid	6. Uralic (Ugric, Paleoarctic)	Mixed colour complexion mesocranic moderately broad and rather low face glabella and superciliary arch more pronounced than the Mongoloid mean stature short (156—160 cm)
	7. Turanian (South Siberian)	Moustache and beard development exceeds the Mongoloid mean moderately brachycranic (cranial index: 80—83) cranial vault high nose more protruding than the Mongoloid mean medium stature (163—166 cm)
	8. Jenissei (Amerikanoid)	Dark colour complexion protruding nose epicanthus frequent brachycephalic short medium stature (160—164 cm)
	9. Other Europoido-Mongoloids	Tibetian
C) Undeterminable	10. Eskimo	a) Chukchi b) Aleutian

Table 3. Homo sapiens — speices collectiva

Great race (subspeices)	Group	Race (mikrosubspecies)	Subrace, other subgroup — Fossil forms
I. Veddo-australoid	A) Southern	1. Australoid	a) Murrayian b) Carpentarian
		2. Tasmanid	a) Vedda b) Gondid
		3. Veddid	c) Malid d) Toalid e) Senoid
	B) Northern	4. Ainuid	
II. Europoid	In detail: see Table 1.		
III. Mongoloid	In detail: see Table 2.		
IV. Negroid	A) Negroids sensu stricto	1. Sudanid (Sudanese) 2. Nilotid 3. Paleonegrid 4. Bantuid (Kafrid)	
	B) Europoido-negroids	5. Etiopid 6. Indomelanid (Dravidian)	
	C) Negro-australoids	7. Melanesid (Melanesian) 8. Paleomelanesid	New-Caledonian
	D) Pygmid	9. Bambutid 10. Negritid (Negrito)	a) Adamanian b) Semang c) Aeta
	E) Undeterminable	11. Khoisanid	a) Khoid (Bushman) b) Sanid (Hottentotta)

V. Amerindid (Americanoid) mixomorphic complex	A) North-American	1. Pacifid 2. Silvid 3. Margid (Paleoamericanoid) 4. Centralid (Middle-Americanoid)	Tepexpan Man (?)
	B) South-American	5. Andid (Andesian) 6. Brazilid (Amazonian) 7. Lagid 8. Pampid 9. Fuegid	Lagoa Santa, Punin